

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 07383 221909Z

42

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W

----- 016999

P R 221212Z SEP 76

FM USDEL SALT II GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 0000X

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

USMISSION NATO

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 7383

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: AMBASSADOR JOHNSON'S STATEMENT OF SEPTEMBER 22, 1976  
(SALT TWO-1088)

THE FOLLOWING IS STATEMENT DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR JOHNSON  
AT THE SALT TWO MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 22, 1976.

QUOTE:

MR. MINISTER:

TODAY I WANT TO DISCUSS THE PROPOSALS THE TWO DELEGATIONS HAVE MADE  
WITH RESPECT TO THE LIMITATION IN THE NEW AGREEMENT ON THE NUMBER OF  
LAUNCHERS OF MISSILES EQUIPPED WITH MIRVS, AND THE VERIFICATION BY  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS OF COMPLIANCE WITH THAT LIMITATION.

PRIOR TO THE RECENT RECESS, EACH DELEGATION TABLED A NEW PROPOSAL  
WITH RESPECT TO THE MIRV LIMITATION, THE SOVIET DELEGATION ON JUNE 23  
AND THE UNITED STATES DELEGATION ON JULY 7. THE LANGUAGE PROPOSED BY  
THE SIDES IS IDENTICAL IN SOME PARTS OF THESE PROPOSALS, INDICATING  
THE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 07383 221909Z

PROGRESS WHICH THE DELEGATIONS HAVE MADE TOWARD REACHING AGREEMENT ON

THIS QUESTION. WITH THE EXCEPTION TO THE REFERENCE TO ASBMS, THE SIDES HAVE TABLED IDENTICAL LANGUAGE FOR PARAGRAPH 1 OF ARTICLE V, WHICH CONTAINS THE BASIC 1320 MIRV AGGREGATE LIMITATION. ALSO, THE SIDES ARE IN AGREEMENT ON THE LANGUAGE FOR AN AGREED STATEMENT DESCRIBING REENTRY VEHICLES WHICH ARE "INDEPENDENTLY TARGETABLE."

HOWEVER, A COMPARISON OF THE TWO DELEGATIONS' PROPOSALS ALSO REVEALS AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT. IT IS THESE AREAS WHICH I WANT TO DISCUSS TODAY.

THE DIFFERENCES THAT REMAIN PRIMARILY RELATE TO TWO QUESTIONS. WHICH BALLISTIC MISSILES ARE TO BE CONSIDERED MISSILES EQUIPPED WITH MIRVS? AND WHICH LAUNCHERS ARE TO BE CONSIDERED LAUNCHERS OF MISSILES EQUIPPED WITH MIRVS? I WILL ADDRESS THESE QUESTIONS IN THAT ORDER.

## II

SOME TYPES OF BALLISTIC MISSILES--FOR EXAMPLE, THE SOVIET ICBM WHICH THE US CALLS THE SS-18--HAVE BEEN FLIGHT TESTED BOTH WITH MIRVS AND WITHOUT MIRVS. IT IS THE US VIEW THAT, IN ORDER TO ENSURE ADEQUATE VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE MIRV LIMITATION, ALL MISSILES WITH BOOSTERS OF A TYPE WHICH HAS BEEN FLIGHT-TESTED WITH MIRVS, WHETHER OR NOT IT HAS ALSO BEEN FLIGHT-TESTED WITHOUT MIRVS, MUST BE CONSIDERED MISSILES EQUIPPED WITH MIRVS. ACCORDINGLY, THE US PROPOSAL FOR PARAGRAPH 5 OF ARTICLE II DEFINES MIRV LAUNCHERS AS LAUNCHERS FOR LAUNCHING A MISSILE "WITH A BOOSTER WHICH IS OF A TYPE THAT HAS BEEN FLIGHT-TESTED ONE OR MORE TIMES" WITH MIRVS. THUS, FOR EXAMPLE, ALL SS-18S WOULD BE CONSIDERED MIRVED MISSILES.

THE SOVIET LANGUAGE FOR PARAGRAPH 5 OF ARTICLE II SPEAKS OF "MISSILES  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 GENEVA 07383 221909Z

WITH" MIRVS. IN THE ABSENCE OF FURTHER ELABORATION, THE US WOULD INTERPRET THIS TO MEAN THAT EACH MISSILE WOULD HAVE TO BE JUDGED INDI-

VIDUALLY AS BEING MIRVED OR NOT. WHILE THERE HAS BEEN MENTION OF THE POSSIBILITY OF AN AGREED STATEMENT RECORDING WHICH MISSILES ARE EQUIPPED WITH MIRVS, FURTHER ELABORATION IS NEEDED TO SHOW HOW THIS STATEMENT WOULD RESOLVE THE QUESTION OF WHICH MISSILES WOULD BE CONSIDERED MIRVED

MISSILES UNDER THE NEW AGREEMENT.

III

THE SECOND QUESTION CONCERNS THE ASSOCIATION OF MIRVED MISSILES WITH LAUNCHERS. THIS ASSOCIATION IS NECESSARY BECUASE THE MIRV AGGREGATE LIMITATION APPLIES TO ICBM AND SLBM LAUNCHERS RATHER THAN TO ICBMS AND

SLBMS. THE ESSENCE OF THE US POSITION IN THIS REGARD IS REFLECTED IN A PROPOSED AGREED STATEMENT TO THE EFFECT THAT A LAUNCHER WILL BE CON-

SIDERED A MIRV LAUNCHER IF ANY LAUNCHER OF THE SAME TYPE HAS EVER CON-

TAINED OR LAUNCHED A MIRVED MISSILE. FURTHER, THE US HAS PROPOSED THAT IN ANOTHER AGREED STATEMENT THE SIDES RECORD THE TYPES OF CURRENT

LAUNCHERD TO BE MIRV LAUNCHERS AND THOSE CONSIDERED NOT TO BE MIRV LAUNCHERS.

THE SOVIET PROPOSALS FOR PARAGRAPH 5 OF ARTICLE II DEFINES MIRV LAUNCHERS AS LAUCCHERS "WHEREIN ARE DEPLOYED" MIRVED MISSILES. IS THE SOVIET PROPOSAL TO BE INTERPRETED TO MEAN THAT A LAUNCHER WOULD BE CONSIDERED SUBJECT TO THE LIMITATION OF ARTICLE V IF, AND ONLY IF, IT CONTAINS OR HAS CONTAINED A MIRVED MISSILE? FURTHER, DOES THE SOVIET

PROPOSAL MEAN THAT IF A PARTICULAR LAUNCHER IS OF THE SAME TYPE AS ANOTHER LAUNCHER WHICH HAS CONTAINED OR LAUNCHED A MIRVED MISSILE, THIS WOULD NOT PROVIDE A BASIS FOR CONSIDERED THAT PARTICULAR LAUNCHER

SUBJECT TO THE MIRV LIMITATION?

MR. MINISTER, I BELIEVE THAT IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE DELEGATIONS  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 GENEVA 07383 221909Z

UNDERSTAND NOT ONLY THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO SIDES, BUT ALSO THE PRACTICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THOSE DIFFERENCES. IT WAS TO THIS END THAT THE US DELEGATION, ON MARCH 23, MADE MENTION OF THE SOVIET ICBM LAUNCHERS IN THE ICBM LAUNCH COMPLEXES NEAR DERAZHNYA AND PERVOM AYSK

IN THE UKRAINIAN S.S.R. OUR OBSERVATIONS OF THESE LAUNCHERS INDICATE THAT SOME OF THEM WERE CONSTRUCTED PRIOR TO 1970 AND SUBSEQUENTLY WERE

CHANGED, OR ARE BEING CHANGED, TO THE CONFIGURATION OF THE TYPE WE ASSOCIATE WITH THE MIRVED ICBM WE CALL THE SS-19. IN THE US VIEW, THESE LAUNCHERS WOULD BE CONSIDERED MIRV LAUNCHERS. UNDER SOVIET APPROACH WOULD THESE LAUNCHERS BE SUBJECT TO THE MIRV LIMITATION? OUR OBSERVATIONS FURTHER INDICATE THAT THE OTHER ICBM LAUNCHERS NEAR DERAZHNYA AND PERVOMAYSK WERE CONSTRUCTED AFTER 1970 ALSO IN THE CONFIUARATION OF THE TYPE WE ASSOCIATE WITH THE SS-19. IN THEUS

VIEW, THESE LAUNCHERS ALSO WOULD BE CONSIDERED MIRV LAUNCHERS. UNDER THE SOVIET APPROACH WOULD THESE LAUNCHERS BE SUBJECT TO THE MIRV LIMITATION?

MR. MINISTER, I ASK THESE QUESTIONS IN ORDER TO DETERMINE THAT EXTENT OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN US ON THIS ISSUE. IF UNDER THE SOVIET APPROACH

ALL OF THE ICBM LAUNCHERS NEAR DERAZHNYA AND PERVOMAYSK WOULD BE CONSIDERED MIRV LAUNCHERS, THEN THERE IS IN FACT LITTLE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN

US. IF, ON THE OTHER HAND, UNDER THE SOVIET APPROACH NOT ALL OF THOSE LAUNCHERS WOULD BE CONSIDERED MIRV LAUNCHERS, IT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO KNOW

THE BASIS FOR THE DISTINCTION WHICH IS MADE BETWEEN THOSE WHICH ARE CON-

SIDERED MIRV LAUNCHERS AND THOSE WHICH ARE NOT. UNQUOTE.  
JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** TEXT, SPEECHES, SALT (ARMS CONTROL), ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 22 SEP 1976  
**Decaption Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** saccheem  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1976GENEVA07383  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** X1  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D760358-0153  
**From:** SALT TALKS  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1976/newtext/t19760933/aaaabchs.tel  
**Line Count:** 186  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION SS  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** saccheem  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 12 MAY 2004  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <12 MAY 2004 by greeneet>; APPROVED <09 SEP 2004 by saccheem>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
04 MAY 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** AMBASSADOR JOHNSON'S STATEMENT OF SEPTEMBER 22, 1976 (SALT TWO-1088) THE FOLLOWING IS STATEMENT DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR  
**TAGS:** PARM, US, UR, (JOHNSON, U ALEXIS)  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006